surface or a blaze surface that reflects the incident light from a color wheel on the end face toward a central axis of the rod integrator, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action at page 2 asserts that Dewald discloses "an end face [Figure 6: (306)] of an outer periphery of the emerging-end opening that receives incident light [Figure 6: (608)] from a color wheel [Figure 6: (606)]..." (emphasis added). The Office Action then at page 3, lines 1-3 admits that Dewald does not disclose that the end face of the outer periphery of the emerging-end opening reflects the incident light from the color wheel. However, the Office Action at page 3 asserts that Oe discloses a scattering surface that reflects light, and thus if Dewald's end surface included Oe's scattering surface, this combination would render the above-mentioned feature of claim 1 obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action has given claim 1 its broadest interpretation. See page 3. Even with the broadest interpretation, the Office Action can not ignore features of claim 1 that are neither disclosed nor suggested by either Dewald or Oe. Specifically, claim 1 recites an end face...being a scattering surface or a blaze surface that reflects the incident light from the color wheel on the end face toward a central axis of the rod integrator.

Referring to Dewald's Fig. 6 and its supporting disclosure at paragraph [0038]-[0040], nowhere does Dewald disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1. Instead, Dewald discloses that light that strikes a mirror on an exit face 306 travels back through the integrator rod 300 again. See paragraph [0040]. In other words, Dewald is referring to light 614 that reflects off an inner surface of the exit face 306 (see Fig. 6), and thus does not disclose or suggest an end face...that reflects the incident light from the color wheel. Moreover, Dewald does not disclose or suggest that the incident light from the color wheel on the end face is reflected towards the central axis of the rod integrator.

Oe, on the other hand, discloses at Figs. 6(a) and 6(b) an example of prisms that reflect light at a predetermined direction. See col. 6, line 66-col. 7, line 10. However, Oe discloses that the prisms are disposed at the inner surface of the light guide 1. See Fig. 4. Thus, Oe does not disclose or suggest an end face...that reflects the incident light from the color wheel. In fact, this feature is not possible with Oe because Oe's apparatus does not even have a color wheel.

Furthermore, even if Oe were to be combined with Dewald, the resulting apparatus would have Dewald's light guide that has Oe's prisms at the inner surface of the light guide to better reflect light towards or away from the end face. This combination does not render obvious an end face...being a scattering surface or a blaze surface that reflects the incident light from the color wheel on the end face toward a central axis of the rod integrator.

The Office Action at page 3 asserts that the combination of Dewald and Oe would render obvious an end face...being a scattering surface that reflects the incident light from the color wheel on the end face toward a central axis of the rod integrator. On the contrary, there is simply no teachings, suggestion or motivation in either Dewald or Oe to provide Oe's prisms at the end face. As discussed above, Oe teaches disposing prisms at the inner surface of the light guide and not the end face. Applicants respectfully submit that there is simply no basis in either Dewald or Oe to combine the references together and one can only conclude that the basis for the combination could have only come from the teachings of the application itself, which, of course, is impermissible hindsight.

Neither Hansen nor Waymouth compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Oe and Dewald.

Hansen discloses in Fig. 2 that optics 2-14 may have increasing heights as they are situated further from the focal point 40. Waymouth discloses that a reflector can have reflectance of greater than 95%.

Therefore, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 2-9 depend on independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

I. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/eks

Date: February 28, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461